UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/554,091	08/14/2006	Hiroshi Ito	P/824-25	2897
2352 7590 05/05/2009 OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN 1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS			EXAMINER	
			LEA, CHRISTOPHER RAYMOND	
NEW YORK, NY 100368403			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1619	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/05/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/554,091	ITO ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Christopher R. Lea	1619					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	Lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
	– action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	·—						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-49</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) <u>1-49</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce		Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 LLS C. & 119(a)	-(d) or (f)					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority arraor oo o.e.o. g 110(a)	(4) 51 (1).					
, ,	1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No.					
	<u> </u>						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
	·						
Attachment(s)							
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)					
2) DNotice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P	atent Application					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	o) [] Other						

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

This application is a 371 (national stage application) of PCT/JP04/05763.

Claims 1-49 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1, 3, 24, 25, & 28-34, drawn to a material having a deodorizing function comprising a paper powder and copper and/or zinc compounds retained in the paper.

Group II, claim(s) 2, 4, & 27, drawn to a material having a deodorizing function comprising a paper powder, carboxymethyl cellulose and copper and/or zinc compounds retained in the carboxymethyl cellulose.

Group III, claim(s) 5, 6, 9-13, 15-23, & 35-49, drawn to a granular excrement treating article made of a material having a deodorizing function comprising a paper powder and copper and/or zinc compounds retained in the paper.

Group IV, claim(s) 7, 8, & 14, drawn to a granular excrement treating article made of a material having a deodorizing function comprising a paper powder, carboxymethyl cellulose and copper and/or zinc compounds retained in the carboxymethyl cellulose.

Group V, claim(s) 26, drawn to a process for making a material having a deodorizing function comprising a paper powder and copper and/or zinc compounds retained in the paper using citrate.

2. As set forth in Rule 13.1 of the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), "the international application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions."

Moreover, as stated in Rule 13.2 PCT, Unity of Invention is satisfied "where a group of inventions is claimed in one and the same international application, the requirement of unity referred to in Rule 13.1 shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features."

The expression "special technical features" shall mean those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole makes over the prior art so linked as to form a single general inventive concept." The material having a deodorizing function of claim 1 does not present a contribution over the prior art, as it is disclosed, and therefore anticipated, in Ishihara et al. (JP 2003-102813, witnessed by the machine translation attached). Ishihara et al. disclose a composition of cellulose particles (paper powder) that supports a metal and/or metal hydroxide compound (claim 1). Ishihara et al. disclose that if zinc and copper metals and hydroxides thereof are particularly desired as the metals if deodorizing function is desired (paragraphs 6 & 9, working example 1). As a result, as currently presented, claim 1 does not possess a special technical feature and, as such, Group I lacks a special technical feature.

3. The inventions listed as Groups I-V do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The technical feature common to Groups I-V is a material having a deodorizing function and having copper and/or zinc compounds in a paper powder. Since the material is known in the prior art,

the claims are not so linked by a special technical feature within the meaning of PCT Rule 13.2 so as to form a single inventive concept, and unity of invention is lacking.

- 4. Due to the complexity of the restriction, no a telephone call was made to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement.
- 5. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

- 6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 7. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

Art Unit: 1619

<u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher R. Lea whose telephone number is (571) 270-5870. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 7:30-5:00 ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on (571)272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/554,091 Page 6

Art Unit: 1619

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CRL

/PORFIRIO NAZARIO GONZALEZ/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1621